

REPRESENTATIONS—(continued).

No. 9.—Reduction of Assessment on Wet and Garden lands.

Messrs. S. Sorappa and Maralegowda, Sira Taluk ; C. Abdūl Razāk, Sira Municipality.

MR. SORAPPA represented that, on account of insufficient rain for successive years, arecanut gardens had dried up in the Sira Taluk and had been converted into dry and wet lands. In spite of the request that dry or wet rates of assessment might be levied on lands where gardens had dried up, Government were levying garden assessment for one reason or other. He prayed that only dry or wet rates might be ordered to be levied on such lands.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that, in regard to the conversion of the *bagayet* into wet lands, Government would make local enquiries and decide the matter.

No. 10.—Reduction of Districts.

Messrs. M. Subbaiya, Seringapatam Municipality ; S. Devaiya and Sivananje Gowda, Seringapatam Taluk.

MR. M. SUBBAIYA represented that the existing eight districts might be reduced to six. The Coimbatore District was a very extensive one and was equivalent to three Mysore Districts. Such a district was managed by one Collector. He therefore thought that, for the present, Kadur and Hassan Districts might be combined into one.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL enquired whether the people of the Kadur and Hassan districts would agree to the combination with Chikmagalur as the district headquarters.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA said that he would agree to the combination and that the question of district headquarters might be considered on merits.

LOKAHITAISHI H. NANJUNDARAJ URS said that the two districts of Tumkur and Chitaldrug might be combined into one district as it was in the past.

MR. MAHOMED IMAM said that there would be many difficulties to the people by such a combination as the people would have to travel long distances for coming to the district headquarters. For this reason, he did not support the proposal made above.

MR. G. MALLANNA said that it was sufficient if the principle of combining the districts was accepted by the Government.

MR. NARAYANA IYENGAR said that, during the time of Dewan Rangacharlu, the experiment of the combination of districts had been tried, but was given up within a very short

period as unworkable. As both the Kadur and Hassan Districts were malnad districts, he was of the opinion that it would become unwieldy for one district officer to manage.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that the combined district of Hassan and Kadur would be smaller than the Mysore District.

MR. NARAYANA IYENGAR said that people would have to travel very long distances to reach the headquarters and as such it would be a very great inconvenience to them particularly when there were no means of rapid locomotion.

MR. BAGAMANE DEVA GOWDA said that all the three malnad districts of Hassan, Shimoga and Kadur had malnad as well as maidan parts. He thought that all the malnad parts might be constituted into one district and the maidan parts into another. This proposal would not only reduce the number of districts to two, but would also tend to the improvement of the malnad.

MR. S. RAMAPPA suggested that the districts might be re-arranged on the basis of either population or area or of revenue, whichever was convenient to Government.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that such a procedure was not possible as it would involve many complications.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA enquired what the savings would be by the abolition of one district.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY replied that it would be about Rs. 40,000.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA was of the opinion that, if the savings was only Rs. 40,000, it was not worthwhile reducing the number of districts. He thought that Engineering, Forest and other departments were not included in the calculation, but that was only savings in the Revenue Department. He said that, a thorough investigation should be made into the matter and the number of districts reduced if the Government stood to save an appreciable amount of money.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA suggested that a committee might be appointed for the purpose, if necessary.

THE DEWAN said that it was a large question and that no definite answer could be given.

No. 11.—Reduction of excessive *phod* charges.

Mr. N. Ramiah, Chikballapur Taluk.

MR. N. RAMIAH said that the *phod* charges for *hissa* survey were very heavy and prayed that the rates of fees as levied now in the places where the scheme was in operation

should be reduced. The number of small *hissas* was more and that of bigger ones, small. The result of this was that small people were made to pay more.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER said that the Deputy Commissioners had power to reduce the fees in cases of special hardship.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that Government would ask the Deputy Commissioners to exercise this power more liberally.

MR. K. RAMIAH SETTY enquired whether the petitions asking for reduction should be stamped.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that it was difficult to answer that question. He personally thought that there was no need to stamp the petition. If the raiyats asked the District Survey Officer, necessary arrangements would be made by him to obtain the orders of the Deputy Commissioner.

MR. BAGAMANE DEVA GOWDA represented that many of the raiyats did not know the powers of the Deputy Commissioner and that therefore the rates might be reduced.

MR. SUBBANNA NAIK brought to the notice of the House that in the *hissā* survey, only pegs had been fixed to indicate the boundary marks and that they should be replaced by stones then and there.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that, if the parties paid for the stones, the department would fix them.

MR. SUBBANNA NAIK said that the people should be forced to pay for these stones. He explained that the raiyats would be quite satisfied for the time being with the fixing of pegs. But while preparing the maps, the *moznidars* would have other influences and would indicate the boundaries in a different way with the result that thereafter the extent included in the *hissa* of a particular raiyat would be much smaller than he was made to believe at the time of fixing the pegs. He therefore said that the map should not be the sole criterion for determining the boundary of a *hissa* until a proper investigation was made. He suggested that a detective officer should be employed to detect such cases of fraud on the part of the *moznidars*. He also wanted that the period for sending up *takrar taktas* should be extended.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that, if complaints were received questioning the bona-fides of these *moznidars*, action would be taken to punish them, if they were at fault.

MR. H. K. MADAIYA did not think that there would be much relief to the raiyats by the appointment of a detective

officer. He wanted, on the other hand, that the inspecting officers should inspect every one of the *hissas* and the measurements connected therewith. As against 10 per cent of measurements which they were now checking, they might at least inspect and check 25 per cent of the measurements, if not more.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that it would not be possible to inspect all the lands as it would necessitate the increase of establishment.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA said that, at present, the rates for the demarcation of *hissas* of *tari*, *bagayet* and *kushki* lands were not different and suggested that differential rates might be fixed as it would help the poor people.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that it was a new principle and would be considered.

No. 12.—Reduction of *phod* charges.

Mr. K. Ramiah Setty, Hosdurga Taluk.

MR. RAMIAH SETTY represented that, when *gomal* and *kaval* lands were disposed of for cultivation, an additional charge of Rs. 2 per acre was being levied as *phoding* charges, that that rate was high and worked as a hardship more especially in the case of *tari* and *bagayet* lands, and prayed that the *phod* charges be fixed at Rs. 2 per *phod* instead of at Rs. 2 per acre. He also said that the subject had been brought up for discussion during the last session of the Assembly and the Government were pleased to say then that they would consult the Revenue Commissioner in the matter.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER said that the fee fixed by Government was Rs. 8 per survey number and that it included the charges for boundary marks also. The charge fixed by Government was actually necessary for carrying out *phod* and measuring work and for fixing boundary marks.

MR. PUTTASAMIGOWDA enquired why the raiyats should pay the charges at the time of auction and why their money should lie idle free of interest with the Government. He also added that, in many cases, though these charges had been levied, the survey work had not been undertaken yet.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that it was absolutely necessary that the charges should be paid at the time of auction. The rules in respect of *phoding* charges were revised at the request of the members of this House. He added that, if the survey was not made, the fee for *phoding* would be returned.

MR. MARIAPPA represented that actual cost might be recovered and not an arbitrary figure.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that it was not possible to calculate the actual cost for each *phod*, and that, if it was done, there was the probability of the raiyats having to pay much more than what they were paying. He added that the representation could not be accepted by the Government.

MR. JATRA NAIK represented that concession in *phod* charges should be shown to the members of the depressed classes. As the present rates were high, they could not pay the charges with the result that they got no *saguvali chit*.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that it was a different matter.

No. 13.—Revision of the fees levied in respect of *hissas* in connection with the Record of Rights Scheme.

Mr. Veerasanjeva Gowda, Closepet Taluk.

(Not discussed—Same as Subject No. 12.)

No. 14.—Reduction of *hissa* fees.

Mr. K. Ramiah Setty, Hosdurga Taluk.

MR. RAMIAH SETTY prayed that Government might be pleased to reduce the *hissa* fees at present levied in connection with the Record of Rights Scheme. He said that Government were making a profit of nearly Rs. 84,000 out of the fees. Instead of making a profit, Government might levy only the amount actually spent by them by apportioning the total amount among the *hissadars*.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said it would take two or three years to complete the work taken on hand and the money now collected would be required for expenditure during that period. It was therefore not correct to say from the amount of a single year that the Government were making a profit out of the fees collected in connection with the said scheme.

Adjournment Motion.

It being 4-30 P.M. the *adjournment motion*, regarding the terms of water supply to the raiyats under the Irwin Canal, was taken up as had been previously fixed.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA moved as follows —

"That the business of the Assembly be adjourned to discuss the recent order passed by Government regarding the terms under which water would be supplied to the raiyats under the Irwin Canal and the system of cultivation to be adopted under the said canal."

At the outset, he thanked the Government and the members of the House for giving him an opportunity to

place before the House the grievances of the raiyats under the Irwin Canal.

The speaker next dealt with the disadvantages of the block system which was proposed to be introduced under the Irwin Canal. He said that the system was practically new to Mysore and that under it the raiyat had to grow on a plot of land paddy in the first year with continuous water supply during the monsoon; raise dry crops such as potatoes, onions, turmeric, etc., during the second year with intermittent supply during the monsoon; and sugar-cane during the third year with intermittent water supply throughout the year. There were many difficulties to the raiyat in such a system of rotation. Supposing a raiyat had 10 acres of land, the speaker asked whether it would be possible for him to grow sugar-cane on his entire plot. He would have to prepare the land for sugar-cane cultivation. He would have to procure seed, manure, cattle and labour. Where should he get the money from? The expenditure would be prohibitive. Granting that he did grow the sugar-cane crop in spite of all these difficulties, under the proposed system, some other crop had to be grown on the land during the next year. For that, he would not require much of labour and many cattle. The speaker asked what should become of the labour, the cattle and other things that the raiyat had got ready during the previous year. Also would any cultivator, having grown paddy or sugar-cane in the previous year, grow commercial crops during the very next year on the same plot of land? Once wet crop was grown on a plot of land, the raiyats would not grow *kushki* crop on it. When commercial crops were raised the raiyats would have no fodder for their cattle. He therefore thought that, if the raiyats would not keep cattle then, the only other course for them was to employ costly tractors which they could not afford.

With regard to contributions, the speaker said that there was a big history behind it. The committee appointed under the chairmanship of Sir M. Visvesvaraya recommended a contribution of Rs. 80 to Rs. 100 per acre; but the raiyats of the locality represented that the minimum might be fixed at Rs. 75. The last committee which was presided over by the present First Member of Council recommended that the contribution might range from Rs. 90 to Rs. 120 per acre according to the fertility of the soil. On this committee, there were many experts and many official and non-official members. It was a wonder to the speaker why the Government had thrown overboard the unanimous recommendation

The Second Member of Council explained that, in the existing Regulation, the population limit was 2,000 and that it was proposed to increase it to 3,000. He also said that in other provinces the minimum was fixed at a higher level.

MR. V. V. IYER thought that not only the minimum population but also the minimum income might form the basis for the constitution of a minor municipality.

Many other members represented that the minimum population might be fixed at 2,500.

MR. L. VEMA REDDY said that even certain villages with a larger population were satisfied to remain as Village Panchayets and did not favour their conversion into minor municipalities for the reason that such a conversion would involve greater financial responsibilities. He, therefore, did not favour any lowering of the population limit.

KHAN BAHADUR MAHOMED ABBAS KHAN and MR. K. A. RAHIM were also of the same opinion and observed that this Regulation should not defeat the Village Panchayet scheme.

MR. MAHOMED IMAM observed that it would be easy enough for any local area to constitute itself into a minor municipality but the difficulty would be experienced only while maintaining it. Certain heavy responsibilities like road maintenance, opening of hospitals, travellers' bungalows, and giving grants to certain institutions, etc., would spring up which it would be beyond the means of a small area to meet. He knew of certain places in the Chitaldrug District where they wanted to go back to their old position as Village Panchayets. He was therefore for retaining the population limit at 3,000.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained that this question was fully discussed by the municipal committee before the minimum was fixed upon and that it was not desirable to reduce it.

This provision was accepted.

(2) Elections.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained as follows :—

Provision has been made for adult suffrage subject to the condition that in order to be qualified to be a voter, one should have resided in the municipality for a period of not less than six months prior to the date of election.

Sub-Para (2).

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained as follows:—

The limit of power of the Municipal Commissioner to enter into contracts without the sanction of the municipal council is also raised from Rs. 500 to Rs. 1,000 in order to avoid frequent references to the municipal council.

MESSRS. M. P. SOMASEKHARA RAO, P. SUBBARAMA CHETTY and B. L. BYANNA were not in favour of raising the power of the Commissioner to enter into contracts.

CAPT. Y. V. AYYA was, however, for accepting the new provision.

THE DEWAN explained that the proposed enhancement of power applied only to the execution of works previously sanctioned by competent authority and would tend to speedy execution. If the proposal was not acceptable, he said that Government would not press it.

At this stage, the SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL referred to item 22 in the statement (Power to fix Costs) which had been left undecided on the previous day, and said that, owing to a number of new sections coming in, it might not be necessary to incorporate Clause 197. He assured the House that the matter would be further scrutinized and a decision reached.

This was agreed to.

II. Minor Municipalities Bill.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained the general principles of the Bill as follows:—

The existing Regulation is found to be unsuitable to minor municipal councils and these councils have been excepted from many of the provisions of the Regulation. Minor municipalities do not require elaborate provisions and the provisions to be made may be limited to what are really essential, the remaining provisions being regulated by rules which the Government may prescribe. The Minor Municipalities Bill has been prepared, keeping these principles in view. The most important changes introduced by the Bill are the following:—

(1) *Constitution of Minor Municipalities.*

The minimum population for constituting an area as a minor municipality is fixed at 3,000.

representative of Malvalli Taluk also should be appointed on the committee and that he was available to serve on it.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH spoke next. With reference to the observation of the seconder of the motion that the representative of the Mandya Taluk did not put up any protest in the committee, he said that he represented the Mandya Taluk on the committee. But when he was appointed, the recommendations of the committee had already been framed and submitted to Government and it was only the form of the mutchalika that came up for discussion during his time. He did not agree to the conditions mentioned in the form and in fact gave a dissenting minute.

Coming to the block system of irrigation, he said that it was a great inconvenience to the people and caused them a lot of difficulties. According to it, in the first year, paddy had to be grown for which the raiyat had to spend large sums of money for digging *hikkals* and *kalves* and purchasing bullocks also for tilling. In the second year, when sugar-cane was to be grown, these *hikkals* and *kalves* served no purpose. So they had to be closed and necessary arrangements made for making the land fit for sugar-cane cultivation. There was thus no use of the bullocks also that had been purchased previously and a lot of additional expenditure had to be incurred for the second crop. When a third crop had to be grown during the third year, all the expenditure previously incurred would be practically a waste. So, on the whole, the raiyat would be put to unnecessary loss. It should therefore be left to his discretion to grow whichever crop it was possible for him to grow, consistent with the means at his command. Instead of this, the Government committed an ordinary raiyat to an expenditure which it was difficult for him to incur.

Objection had been taken that, if all the lands were allowed to be grown with wet crops, the health of the locality would seriously suffer. But there was nothing in his opinion to show that that was really the case. At any rate, he was for giving the discretion to the raiyats and watching the results.

In regard to contribution itself, the speaker said that it was too much for the average raiyat to bear seeing that he had to incur a lot of expenditure, as already explained by him, to make the lands fit for cultivation. Owing to this fact, the value of lands in the Mandya Taluk had already gone down very much. If, in addition to this, Government levied contribution of Rs. 100 to Rs. 150 per acre, it was

certainly impossible for the raiyat to pay it. Even if Government could think of giving him loan by starting a bank, he could not possibly liquidate the debt. And in the absence of means for liquidating his debt, his only remedy was to leave the country, in which case, almost all the areas would be depopulated. He suggested that the Government might take charge of a certain portion of the land, say one-third or one-fourth from the raiyats and in return for it cancel the contribution payable on the remaining portion of the land.

MR. B. SEETHARAMAIA narrated his experience about the working of the block system under the Vani Vilas Sagara and how it proved an utter failure later on. He requested Government not to introduce that kind of system into Mysore and spoil the prospects of the raiyats in this region also.

MR. CHELUVIAH said that the lands under the channel were not on the same level and that sugar-cane cultivation would not prosper on low lands. Hence he thought that the block system would not help all the raiyats in the same way as Government expected. He was afraid that, if the system was introduced, there was a likelihood of cultivation under the canal being entirely given up in the long run.

Referring to the question of contribution, he said that it had been stated in the order of Government that it was the recognised practice to calculate the rates of contribution on the basis of not less than one-half the difference between the value of dry and irrigated lands in the locality and that from that point of view the rates now ordered could not be regarded as unreasonably high. He did not know why it was not to be ordered as half the difference when on a previous occasion it was said as one-third the difference.

He also observed that, in the upper part of the reservoir, the contribution levied was only Rs. 60 per acre without any stipulation in regard to the payment of interest. He did not see why a different treatment should be given in the case of the raiyats in question.

Again it was said that the reservoir was built with the aid of tax-payers' money from the 67 taluks of the State in order to benefit these 5 taluks. He contended that, as a matter of fact, it was not so. In the first place, the reservoir was built for the generation of electricity. In the second place, it was only the excess water that was not required therefor that was given for cultivation. In the third place, it was to show to other places that Mysore was a model state that this big project was launched. If the project for irrigation should really benefit the raiyats, then the block system

should be given up and with it the contribution also. If these were not done, he was sure that the raiyats would not be able to continue to hold their lands and that the lands would pass away very rapidly to others.

Even in regard to the arrangement for the cultivation of sugar-cane, Sir Alfred Chatterton had said that, to grow sugar-cane in the whole area, as much as Rs. 40 lakhs would be necessary in order to prepare the lands fit for cultivation and procure the necessary manure. He did not see how such a huge amount could be commanded by the raiyats.

The block system was disadvantageous to the raiyats from another point of view. If paddy was grown in the first year, due to the artificial manure having been used, the next year the land would become saltish and no sugar-cane crop could possibly be grown as the same manure would not be suitable for all kinds of crops.

He therefore suggested that a responsible committee might be appointed to investigate into all the above matters and submit their recommendations for the orders of Government. And till then, he said, Government should not insist that, until the mutchalikas were obtained, water would not be let into the lands.

MR. P. SITHARAMIAH agreed with the mover that the Government should not have taken very fertile portions of the lands for the experimental farm. It was not proper for Government to appropriate a particular fertile spot for experimental purposes instead of carrying on their experiments in the lands of the raiyats themselves.

With regard to the block system of irrigation, he did not agree with the mover. Speaking from his own experience, he said that villages like Palahalli and Belagola which were situated on the right bank channel had water in their lands throughout the year, with the result that already the places had become almost depopulated and that, if this state of things continued, they might become extinguished in course of time. On the other hand, for about 10 miles under the low level channel, no water was let throughout the year and during summer the health conditions of the villages were very good. That showed that the block system of irrigation was really a blessing. At present, about 90,000 acres were under *kushki* cultivation. If all these were converted to *tari* at the same time, large amount of labour would be required and it would be no doubt difficult to find it.

In regard to sugar-cane cultivation, he said that by growing commercial crops immediately after sugar-cane

cultivation, the yield was invariably much more than if the same crop was grown consecutively. In support of this statement, he said that the lands near Satyamangalam and Coimbatore, where such practice was going on, had given always a very good yield.

With regard to the statement that the raiyat would have to spend a large sum of money on manure for taking up the rotation system, he said that there was absolutely no difficulty in the Mysore District. After the introduction of compost in Mysore, it was possible to get any amount of manure of this kind which costs only about Rs. 4 per ton, while for any other artificial manure of the same quality, a sum of at least Rs. 50 had to be spent. He therefore did not think that the provision of suitable manure was such an insuperable difficulty.

It was pointed out by certain members that a person having a large extent of land might have to undergo a lot of difficulties to bring all that extent under cultivation unless machinery was employed at great cost. The speaker did not think that this was also an insuperable difficulty. For, if only the system of co-operation which was practised in Western countries was adopted here under which all raiyats of the locality joined together for the purpose of cultivation by exchange on some *guttige* terms, every piece of land could be cultivated without any trouble and without going in for any machinery.

Another objection raised by the members was that there would be difficulty for fodder. In this connection, the speaker said that in certain lands there was absolutely no *gomal* attached to them. Here what the raiyats did was to grow ragi and get the required quantity of fodder.

The speaker then said that there were no sufficient reasons for the complaint that the contribution was very high. The Government spent as much as Rs. 4 crores on the reservoir, the interest on which alone amounted to Rs. 16½ lakhs roughly. This amount had necessarily to be found from the general revenues unless the raiyats benefited by it paid for the water utilised by them. He did not see any reason why, when the benefit was derived by a particular locality, the other parts of the State should contribute to their expenditure.

With regard to the levy of interest on the unpaid instalment of contribution, he said that it was open to Government to waive it if they liked. And he thought there was sufficient justification for it.

MR. VENKATARAMANE GOWDA also did not think that the cultivation under the canal should be restricted by the introduction of the block system. It was open to the raiyats to grow any kind of crops that they liked and for which they had sufficient means. He thought that, on most occasions where committees had been appointed by Government, they generally agreed with the recommendations of such committees and that there was no reason why in this particular instance, Government should have gone beyond their recommendations. In his opinion, if an acre of land at present was not worth even Rs. 50, it was wrong to demand a contribution of Rs. 150 per acre.

MR. NANJAPPA suggested that, as the people were poor and were unable to pay, a part of the land might be allowed to be cultivated with *kushki* crops. He added that the interest also might be waived.

MR. IBRAHIM KHAN was of opinion that the Government should take into consideration the plight of the people and if possible to reduce their contribution. In any case, he did not consider that the scheme of cultivation should be delayed by awaiting the recommendations of one committee or another.

MR. B. USMON KHAN said that the block system would be good both in the interests of Government and the people.

With regard to contribution, he said that it was not quite necessary that, if the first committee suggested Rs. 100 per acre, the same opinion should stand for all time. The reservoir was constructed at considerable expense and the raiyats benefited thereby should be made to realise that water thus stored was very valuable and should be paid for. Even in places where an assured supply of water was not given, larger contributions were levied. In this view, he did not understand why the people of Mysore District who had all the advantages should pay less than their compeers in other parts of the State. He also said that the raiyats under the Irwin Canal had no anxiety about rain or want of rain, and that the contribution rate of Rs. 150 per acre they were called upon to pay was nothing and could even be raised to Rs. 300. He thought that, if the raiyats really relinquished their lands at any time, there were any number of people from other districts ready to take them up. In this view, he was not for the reduction of contribution rates at all.

At this stage, MR. H. C. DASAPPA moved for closure of the debate.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA seconded the motion.

THE DEWAN said that there were a number of members desirous of speaking on the motion and that it would not be right to close the debate.

MR. M. S. LINGE GOWDA was of opinion that the water spent on paddy cultivation was absolutely a waste and that this kind of cultivation spoiled the health of the country. He agreed that the rotation of crops was good for the country. He was of opinion that, if a man had 30 acres of land, he might be allowed to set apart one-third of it permanently for *tari* cultivation and the rest for *kushki*. Paddy cultivation by itself did not require much effort on the part of the raiyats and he was firmly of opinion that partiality to this cultivation was responsible for making the raiyats idle. He however thought that, until experience was gained at the experimental farm, the block system might not be insisted upon.

In regard to contribution, he did not see why the money paid by 70 taluks of the State should be spent only in one district. In the Bangalore District, sometimes for digging a well, a raiyat had to spend something like Rs. 7,000 and yet very often he would not be sure of an assured supply of water, while in the Mysore District, after contribution was paid, the raiyat had no further bother of spending any money on sinking wells at all. The speaker was of opinion that instead of wasting much water on *tari* cultivation much of it could be usefully utilised for *bagayet* cultivation.

He also did not see why Government should insist upon the cultivation of sugar-cane alone during any year. Sugar-cane cultivation required the expenditure of large sums of money on it and a raiyat might not be able to provide all that amount. On the other hand, the raiyat could grow chillies, onions, ground-nut, etc.

He however requested Government to give necessary marketing facilities and establish credit banks. Unless they were done, he said that the scheme would not be a practicable one.

MR. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA doubted whether the block system was really introduced under the advice of the Agricultural Department. He thought that, if the income and expenditure on the lands were compared, it would show that cultivation under the canal on the terms stated by Government would not be profitable.

Referring to Mr. Sitharamiah's statement that the block system had its advantages, he enquired why such a

system was not introduced in the villages referred to by him.

As regards the argument that there was no reason why the money of the rate-payers of the 70 taluks should be spent on the Mysore District, the speaker said that similarly the payments made by the raiyats of the Mysore District were spent on the Thippagondanahalli project and many other schemes worked in the other districts of the State.

MRS. SAKAMMA admitted that Government had to spend something like Rs. 5 crores on the reservoir and requested that, seeing the acute economic condition of the raiyats, if nothing else could be done for their relief, at least the contribution levied might be appreciably reduced.

At this stage, MR. H. C. DASAPPA moved again that the question be put as there had been ample discussion on the subject on all sides.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA seconded the motion.

THE DEWAN said that there appeared to be some more members wishing to express their views.

MR. VENKATAVARADACHAR said that there was no difficulty at all involved in the introduction of the block system of irrigation. In Kolar, for instance, if a raiyat had 4 acres of land, he grew 4 different crops on it and that too after spending a large amount of money for sinking a well and for providing himself with manure and other things. But, in Mysore District, the raiyats would have an assured supply of water and good manure on account of the rotation of crops as fixed by Government and without any anxiety in regard to the yield. In this view, he thought that the contribution demanded from them was nothing when compared with similar contributions paid by the raiyats in other districts where an assured supply of water was not available.

With regard to sugar-cane cultivation, the speaker admitted that it was a costly crop and was not within the means of every raiyat. For that, he suggested that a definite portion of the land might be set apart for this kind of cultivation.

THE SECRETARY, KRISHNARAJASAGARA WORKS, then spoke as follows:—

Three vital points to be considered and borne in mind in dealing with the system of cultivation to be adopted under the Irwin Canal and the development of irrigation under it are—

- (1) the cost of the irrigation side of the scheme;

- (2) prevention of waste of water stored at such heavy cost and obtaining as great an advantage as possible to the people; and
- (3) prevention of insanitary conditions and unhealthiness in the tract to be irrigated.

These will be briefly explained at the outset.

The total cost of the irrigation portion will be about three and a half crores of rupees and the whole amount is met from State Funds and thus contributed by the people of the whole State. Of the water stored, only about one-sixth is intended for power generation and the major portion of the storage is for irrigation. Thus, it is clear that Government should obtain a reasonable return from irrigation in the interests of the general tax-payers.

Secondly, according to the Agreement with Madras, it is permissible to irrigate only 125,000 acres under the reservoir. If by the system of irrigation adopted, waste of water is allowed, it will not be possible to irrigate fully even the small area permissible and by unrestricted paddy cultivation as at present carried on by the raiyats, a great deal of the water is sure to be wasted into the river lower down. It will be seen therefore how necessary it is to prevent waste of water and develop a system of irrigation to make the water go as far as possible.

Thirdly, the tract to be served is quite unlike the irrigated area under the existing channels. The area commanded is about 60 miles in length and about 20 miles in breadth so that the numerous villages in the locality will be surrounded by cultivation under the canals. If unrestricted paddy cultivation is allowed, water-logging is sure to result on account of the present habits of cultivation of the raiyats and the whole tract will become insanitary. The result of such conditions is well-known and need not be dilated upon.

At this stage, it was found that there was no quorum and the House was adjourned to meet at 12 noon the next day.